Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/18/2004
First Name:	Cathy
Last Name:	Callier
Title:	Registrar
Address:	3053 Fried Ave
City:	San Diego
State:	CA
Zip Code:	92122
Phone No.:	858 452 9306
Email Address:	cathy@lajollasoccer.org
Topic:	Energy and Minerals
Comments:	I dread having to look at my energy bill every month wondering about the increases and how I am going to afford this. PLease support this project.

G171-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/20/2004
First Name:	John
Last Name:	Carlson
Address:	2835 Main St.
City:	Susanville
State:	CA
Zip Code:	96130
Topic:	Alternatives
Comments:	Cabrillo Port is the right solution to California's energy crisis. We won't have to allow for more drilling on our public lands and the impacts of the project are minimal. This facility would receive LNG, store it, turn it back into gas and feed it into existing natural gas pipelines. Is the better solution more drilling onshore drilling that would lead to more pipelines being built. No, this is the logical solution.

G330-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/20/2004
First Name:	Tim
Last Name:	Carroll
Address:	8669 Via Alta Way
City:	Elk Grove
State:	CA
Zip Code:	95624
Topic:	Land Use
Comments:	After reviewing the draft EIS of this project, I felt compelled to comment on one thing - and per you suggestions, we will call it "land use". I understand that pipelines will have to be installed, however, from what I'm understanding, this will have minimal effect envirnmentally speaking. My concern would be that we would continue drilling beautiful open spaces. I visit Colorado often and normally drive. It's disturbing to me to see all the drilling that is done along the way. There are constant desires for more drilling in these areas. I like Cabrillo Port because it does not call for drilling on our open spaces. It's an offshore port that we will never know is there. I believe it is has great benefits in regards to land use. We must protect what we have, but not be dumb and think we don't need to produce more energy. I think this is a win-win situation.

G273-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

DEC. 15. 2004 9:38PM
308793

NO. 436 P. 1/1

Source:
USCG Docket

USCG-2004-16877-697

Date: 12/20/04

I attended your hearing in Ventura County on Nov. 30th with my family but was not given time to speak. We waited for nearly 2 hours. In the future please allow one person from each side to speak so that one opinion does not monopolize the meeting. G419-1

I strongly support the LNG facility. It will bring good jobs and clean energy to our area. G419-2

Maribel Castillo

MARIBEL CASTILLO – Sun Valley
7831 Vineland Avenue, Apartment # 16

Docket No. USCG-2004-16877
State Clearinghouse No.
20044021107

2004/G419

G419-1
The notices for the public meetings and the information provided at the public meetings indicated that commenters would speak in the order that their requests were received, after elected officials and representatives of government agencies were heard. We regret that you were unable to stay at the meeting to provide oral testimony; however, your submitted written comment carries the same weight as any oral comments provided at public hearings.

G419-2
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

To Whom It May Concern:

I was unable to speak at your recent Oxnard hearing for the LNG port facility. I support it. This is a safe project that will be a big help to our community. | G420-1 & -2

Rosa Castillo

ROSA CASTILLO
7831VINELAND AVE. APT. 16
SUN VALLEY, CA 91352

Docket No. USCG-2004-16877
State Clearinghouse No.
20044021107

G420-1
The notices for the public meetings and the information provided at the public meetings indicated that commenters would speak in the order that their requests were received, after elected officials and representatives of government agencies were heard. We regret that you were unable to stay at the meeting to provide oral testimony; however, your submitted written comment carries the same weight as any oral comments provided at public hearings.

G420-2
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

DEC. 19. 2004 9:27PM NO. 421 P. 1

308750

USCG-2004-16877-684

I showed up to speak out in favor of the LNG building project off of the Oxnard shore but wasn't given time to speak. G421-1

Please register my support for this important project for our local economy. G421-2

Source: USCG Docket Date: 12/19/04

Sergio Castillo
7831 Vineland #16
Sun Valley, CA 91352

Docket No. USCG-2004-16877
State Clearinghouse No.
20044021107

G421-1
The notices for the public meetings and the information provided at the public meetings indicated that commenters would speak in the order that their requests were received, after elected officials and representatives of government agencies were heard. We regret that you were unable to stay at the meeting to provide oral testimony; however, your submitted written comment carries the same weight as any oral comments provided at public hearings.

G421-2
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/16/2004
First Name:	Dylann
Last Name:	Ceriani
Title:	Mrs.
Address:	11685 Negley Dr.
City:	San Diego
State:	CA
Zip Code:	92131
Topic:	Energy and Minerals
Comments:	We need to disentangle ourselves from the need for foreign energy sources, as well as find new environmentally friendly, less costly ways to produce power!

G043

G043-1
G043-2

G043-1
Section 1.2 discusses dependence on foreign energy sources.

G043-2
Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/15/2004
First Name:	Grant
Last Name:	Chappell
Address:	180 Brannan St. #419
City:	San Francisco
State:	CA
Zip Code:	94107
Topic:	Marine Traffic
Comments:	The site selected by the BHP officials is far enough from shipping channels to cause any major problems. Although traffic will need to be restricted near the Cabrillo Port facility, the smart location choice will prevent it from being a hassle. Overall, I think the planners have done an excellent job of thinking through all the possible problems the LNG might create and mitigating or eliminating them. For that they should be commended.

G023-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

From: Beth Charas [mailto:bethcharas@avenuecable.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2004 12:01 AM
To: Kusano, Ken LT
Cc: savethecoast@sierrablub.org
Subject: LNG facility at Oxnard

Dear Lieutenant Kusano,

The rest of the world is not going to tolerate our hogging of the underground energy resources forever. At some point, probably in less than 20 years, they are going to object with much violence. Instead of sinking large sums of money in facilities that are doomed to be destroyed it would be smarter to start doing now what we will be forced to do in the future i.e. developing sun, sea, wind, and conservation energy policies and projects.

G422-1

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Charas

G422-1
Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

Sholly, Brian

Source:
Letter to CSLC Commission

Date: 12/20/04

From: Beth Charas [bethcharas@avenuecable.com]
Sent: Monday, December 20, 2004 8:56 PM
To: ogginsc@slc.ca.gov
Cc: savethecoast@sierraclub.org
Subject: LNG project in Oxnard

Dear Mr. Coggins,

The rest of the world is not going to tolerate our hogging all of the below ground energy resources forever. At some point, probably in less than 20 years, they will object with much violence. We had better get started on using wind, solar, the movement of the oceans, conservation etc because sooner or later we will be forced to change. Spending huge amounts of money for the LNG facility does not make sense in the long run. G423-1

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Charas

G423-1
Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

308446

Donna Cleary
11656 Negley Drive
San Diego, CA 92131
858-549-2548

2004 DEC 17 A 7:44

December 15, 2004

Docket Management Facility
U.S. Department of Transportation
Room PL-401
400 Seventh Street SW
Washington, DC 20590-0001

USCG-2004-16877-615

To Whom It May Concern:

There is nothing beautiful about energy! But it is desperately needed and we as Californian's can no longer turn away and fear projects that will bring new sources of energy to production. The Cabrillo Port Natural Gas Deepwater Port has my full support.

The project has successfully addressed many environmental and aesthetic concerns and should be allowed to proceed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Donna Cleary

2004/G490

G490-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

From: twocoles@adelphia.net [mailto:twocoles@adelphia.net]
Sent: Saturday, December 18, 2004 5:26 PM
To: Kusano, Ken LT
Subject: Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR

Attention: K Kusano

I request a 60-day extension to the December 20, 2004 deadline on comments re. the Cabrillo Port LNG draft EIS/EIR. It seems obvious that BHP Billiton strategically planned to present this project at a time when people are involved with holiday plans. It also seems discriminatory to foist this project on a low income Hispanic area where most residents do not have time or funds to protest. G424-1 G424-2

The overwhelming issue is public safety. Although I do not live in Oxnard, many Port Hueneme residences are closer to where the floating storage and regasification unit would be than most Oxnard residences. We are especially near Ormond Beach where the proposed onshore LNG metering station would be located. The only security measure in the draft EIS/EIR is a fence. Terrorists or vandals could cut the fence to place bombs causing a natural gas explosion or release of vapor or both. There doesn't seem to be much security other than a mention of the Coast Guard. Since we have a naval base located in Port Hueneme with the only deep water port between San Francisco and Los Angeles which needs heavy security, can you assure me that the metering station and the floating storage unit would have adequate Coast Guard protection? G424-3

Thank you for your attention to this serious security threat.

A deeply concerned citizen,

Marjorie Cole
Port Hueneme

G424-1
All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

G424-2
Sections 4.19.1 and 4.19.4 contain information on potential Project impacts on minority and low-income communities and mitigation measures to address such impacts.

G424-3
The Project has been modified since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR, and the odorant station has been relocated to the FSRU with a smaller backup odorant facility onshore. Sections 2.4.1.3, 4.2.7, 4.7.4, 4.12, 4.18.4, 6.2.2, and 6.2.3 contain updated text on this topic.

Appendix C3-2 contains information on marine safety and security requirements.

The analysis indicates that the consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would not reach the shoreline. Section 4.2.7.4 contains information on the major laws, regulatory requirements and plans for public safety regarding the FSRU and LNG carriers. Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on this topic. Impact PS-4 in Section 4.2.8.4 discusses the potential for accidental or intentional damage at onshore facilities, including

the Ormond Beach Metering Station.

G491

The Cabrillo Port LNG draft EIS/EIR shows this project is untested and untried anywhere else in the world and also unsafe.Not only would the floating storage and regasification unit be a target for terrorists but also a danger due to earthquakes or ships straying into it in fog. The metering station on Ormond Beach, surrounded by only a fence is a great hazard to the nearby residences both in Oxnard and Port Hueneme. The heavy security needed is not dealt with. G491-1 G491-2 G491-3

G491-1
Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

G491-2
Table 4.2-2 identifies representative hazards and threats considered in the public safety analysis.

Section 4.11 contains revised information on seismic and geologic hazards and mitigation that specifically addresses the potential damage to proposed pipelines from a direct rupture along fault lines. Appendices J1 through J4 contain additional evaluations of seismic hazards.

G491-3
The Project has been modified since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR, and the main odorant station has been relocated to the FSRU with a smaller backup odorant facility onshore. Section 2.4.1.2 describes the facilities at the Ormond Beach Metering Station. Sections 2.4.1.3, 4.2.7, 4.7.4, 4.12, 4.18.4, 6.2.2, and 6.2.3 contain updated text on this topic. Section 4.2.8.2 and Appendix C3 under “Design and Safety Standards Applicable to Natural Gas Transmission Pipelines” identify safety regulations for onshore facilities. Impact PS-4 in Section 4.2.8.4 discusses the potential for accidental or intentional damage at onshore facilities, including the Ormond Beach Metering Station.

311813

2004/G533

Kusano, Ken LT USCG-2004-16877-898

From: twocoles@adelphia.net
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2004 11:56 PM
To: ogginsc@slc.ca.gov
Subject: Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR

Attention: Cy Oggins

I request a 60-day extension to your December 20, 2004 deadline on comments re. the Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR. It seems obvious the BHP Billiton strategically planned to present this project at a time when people are involved with holiday plans. G533-1

I became alarmed about this proposed installation when I attended the public hearing held in Oxnard on November 30. My neighbors and I later spoke opposing it at the Port Hueneme City Council meeting. There are many reasons to be concerned.

The overwhelming issue is public safety. Although I do not live in Oxnard, many Port Hueneme residences are closer to where the floating storage and regasification unit would be than some Oxnard residences. We are especially near Ormond Beach where the proposed onshore LNG metering station would be located. The only security measure in the draft EIS/EIR is a fence. Terrorists or vandals could cut the fence to place bombs causing a natural gas explosion or release of vapor. There doesn't seem to be much security other than a mention of the Coast Guard. We have a naval base located in Port Hueneme with the only deep water port between San Francisco and Los Angeles. This needs heavy security and there doesn't seem to be extra Coast Guard personnel allocated for the metering station. Also Ormond Beach is a wetlands with a bird sanctuary. We wish to enhance our community by protecting the Oxnard wetlands and the Channel Islands marine sanctuary. This natural beauty, once destroyed, will not be there for us or future generations. Please keep in mind that vandals or terrorists are not the only concern. Earthquakes are a given in California and these could also cause great damage to this facility. G533-2 G533-3 G533-4 G533-5

Discrimination has also been questioned. The population in Oxnard where the pipelines would pass through tends to be low-income Hispanic people, many without the time or funds to protest. I have read in the newspaper that there is now some thought of not placing these pipelines by schools or our one hospital, St. John's. Who are they now considering endangering? G533-6 G533-7

We need time to look into the record of the Australian company, BHP Billiton. Apparently their record on LNG accidents and assaults on the environment is not a good one. I understand that the LNG risk of igniting is during the regasification process. An explosion during this process would most likely take the lives of those on the floating storage unit, pollute the water killing the marine life and cause air pollution to many communities. G533-8 G533-9

There is also concern that this installation, once put in place, would be regulated by the federal government. Our state of California and our cities would have no control over it. Since this installation has never been done before, and is untested and untried, we do not want to be the guinea pigs. BPH Billiton assures us that it is computer modeled by outstanding engineers. Contemplating NASA's record, this does not give us a secure feeling. G533-10 G533-11

A deeply concerned citizen,

12/22/2004

G533-1
All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

G533-2
Table 4.2-2 and Sections 4.2.6.1 and 4.2.7.6 contain information on the threat of terrorist attacks.

G533-3
See the response to Comment G533-2.

G533-4
Section 4.8.1.1 and Impacts TerrBio-1, -2, and -3 in Section 4.8.4 discuss existing conditions at Ormond Beach and impacts on wetlands.

Section 4.7.1.4 discusses the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary and Ormond Beach.

G533-5
Section 4.11 discusses this topic.

G533-6
Sections 4.19.1 and 4.19.4 contain information on potential Project impacts on minority and low-income communities and mitigation measures to address such impacts.

G533-7
Section 2.4 describes the proposed onshore pipeline routes. Chapter 4 identifies impacts of the proposed routes by resource subject area.

G533-8
The Deepwater Port Act requires that that the Project applicant demonstrate financial responsibility. One of the purposes of this EIS/EIR is to identify, assess, and mitigate (when possible) potential environmental and socio-economic impacts to aid the decision-makers to reach an informed decision.

G533-9
Section 4.2.7.6 discusses the public safety risks of an offshore LNG spill; Section 4.6.4 discusses air quality impacts of a potential LNG spill; and Section 4.7.4 discusses impacts on marine life.

G533-10
Sections 1.1, 1.2.1, and 1.3 and Table 4.2-3 discuss the roles of Federal, State and local agencies regarding approval and regulation of the Project.

G533-11
Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

Marjorie Cole
Port Hueneme

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/20/2004
First Name:	Patti
Last Name:	Colston
Address:	159 Cakebread Circle
City:	Sacramento
State:	CA
Zip Code:	95834
Topic:	Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis
Comments:	I appreciate school administrators getting involved in issues that might affect the children at their school. However, the comments I've read in regards to Cabrillo Port are simply exasperating. There are gas lines all over. Guess what, if you have natural gas in your house, you have a pipeline in your backyard. Are you going to move because of it? If you don't have natural gas in your house, your neighbor might, or a local county building might. Still you could have a gas line on your property. If you're going to get involved in children's safety issue, I believe you could find something else to spend your quality time on.

G380-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Comment Form—Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR

Source:
Public Meeting - Oxnard PM

Date: 11/30/2004

Name *(Please Print)*: Connett, Joe

Organization/Agency: _____

Street Address: 71 Caronado St

City: Ventura State: CA Zip Code: 93001

Email address: _____

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop this form into the comment box.

You may also submit comments

- ***Electronically through the Project Web site at http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com***
- ***Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at http://dms.dot.gov.***
- ***Or by mail or email to following addresses:***

Docket Management Facility
Room PL-401
400 Seventh Street SW
Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825
ogginsc@slc.ca.gov
Attention: Cy Oggins

All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary):

I am concerned about the environmental impact of this project and its role in increasing our dependency on non renewable energy. **G081-1**

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

G081-1
Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/16/2004
First Name:	Trevor
Last Name:	Connolly
Address:	5065 Longbranch
City:	San Diego
State:	CA
Zip Code:	92107
Topic:	Environmental Justice
Comments:	Too often poorer communities are left bearing the burden on hosting the infrastructure necessary to support the society at large. Cabrillo Port, however, turns this idea on its head by saying that no-one should. Since the floating facility is located near no communities, Cabrillo Port has practically no impacts on any communities—rich or poor—which makes it the most environmentally just type of project possible Thanks for registering my support for this project

G055-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/16/2004
First Name:	Jennifer
Last Name:	Cook
Address:	27155 Clifton Ave
City:	Highland
State:	CA
Zip Code:	92346
Topic:	Alternatives
Comments:	Although LNG is not explosive, in its gaseous form, there is always going to be a risk associated with natural gas and its transportation. For the largest component of the Cabrillo Port project—the floating terminal at sea—this is not a consideration. On land, however, it was. BHP listened to residents' concerns and moved the proposed pipeline to existing rights-of-way that are farther away from residents than the pipelines being used today by the Gas Company. I appreciate their efforts on this

G051-
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/16/2004
First Name:	David
Last Name:	Cooney
Address:	3132 Sepulveda
City:	San Bernardino
State:	CA
Zip Code:	92404
Topic:	Socioeconomics
Comments:	I love where I live. We are all lucky to be in a state with such an amazing environment, with an economy that supports the quality of life we all enjoy. Our quality of life continues to put incredible demands on our current limited energy supplies. And unless something is done soon, our quality of life will be brought to a halt with increased energy costs and rolling blackouts. Cabrillo Port offers us a solution that will prevent another electricity crisis, while also having minimal impact to the environment. It will supply us with a safe, clean, reliable and cost-effective supply of energy. Cabrillo Port will also improve our local economy, contributing more than $25 million in Ventura County alone. Eventually, I hope to see an increase in the use of alternative energy sources like solar and wind. But these technologies are still new, and much too expensive to be considered a viable source of reliable energy. Cabrillo Port will let us enjoy our quality of life by keeping our lights on in the short-term. Cabrillo Port will also contribute to a longer term energy strategy that preserves our spectacular environment for future generations.

G065-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
First Name:	Guy
Last Name:	Cooper
Title:	California PE (E-6193)
Address:	484 Rancho Dr.
City:	Ventura
State:	CA
Zip Code:	93003
Phone No.:	805-653-0556
Email Address:	sdlgc@earthlink.net
Additional Topic:	Other/General Comment
Comments:	1. Any land-based LNG terminal can be hazardous to public safety in an urban area. Proposed off-shore floating terminal (including gasification) seems reasonably safe. A major fuel-air explosion is unlikely (would be ignited before optimum mixing occurs); blast over-pressures on land would be minimal due to off-shore distance. 2. Most likely hazard of off-shore terminal is collision by a ship out of its normal lane. 3. In present climate of increasing energy cost, & increasing dependence on foreign sources, it is reasonable & expedient to diversify various current foreign sources. Development of long term domestic sources (solar, wind, & nuclear) should continue. LNG opposition argument that building the Cabrillo Port LNG facility would preclude these domestic sources is not logical & does not fit into comprehensive, rational long term energy plan. 4. Opposition argument that gas pipe lines would be new & dangerous not correct, already have high pressure cross-country natural gas pipe lines. 5. Pressure at which sea floor gas pipe would operate not discussed. Sea bed pipelines are a proven technology; however, stress in a corrosive (sea water) environment, as well as pressure fluctuations and sea flow currents, could result in fatigue failure of the pipes. This would depend upon working pressure & metal alloy and outer protection. G126-1 6. Should terminal be located on an off-shore island, following possible spin-off's are: G126-2 a. Construction camp later becomes tourist or youth camping facility, or oceanographic research facility. b. Any major spill/fire/explosion confined to that part of island. c. Terminal would be away from shipping lanes. 7. Terminal could form basis for spin-off industries: terminal for exporting hydrocarbon gases produced in California; a thermodynamic heat sink to assist food freeze-drying industry; and supply for LNG-fueled busses and trucks (as opposed to CNG) G126-3 a. Twin 24 in. ocean floor pipes could be used to send out bound California-produced hydrocarbons for export during times when methane was not in-coming. Standard multiple-use technologies for high pressure pipes would be employed to prevent any mixing of different gases. The heat sink provided by the chilled LNG could help in liquefying the export gases. This achieved by direct heat transfer from the export gas in question, provided it has higher boiling point than LNG (-263 deg. F); or, the LNG could serve as a heat sink for more efficient additional refrigeration of export gas to a liquid.. b. The gasified methane could be kept chilled during movement to shore where a food freeze-drying facility would use the free cold (head sink). c, Chilled, high pressure gas brought ashore would require less refrigeration to convert it back to LNG for transportation use. d. Chilled, high pressure gas brought ashore would, if run through expander turbine, provide both heat sink and pumping power to chill other hydrocarbon gases exported in liquid form. 5. To gasify the LNG, more economical & enviironmentally cleaner to use ocean as heat supply, bu using sea bed pipes as heat exchanger. A concentric insulated pipe system envisioned to prevent freezing adjacent sea water while controlling heat input and boiling of LNG along length of ocean floor pipes. Must not freeze sea water about the pipes else G126-4

G126-1
The maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) for each of the twin 24-inch subsea pipelines is 1,500 pounds per square inch gauge (psig). Over the length of the subsea pipelines, pressures would decrease to 1,100 psi at the meter and piping at the onshore metering station. The MAOP for the 36-inch Center Road Pipeline and its alternatives is 1,100 psi, and the MAOP for the 30-inch Line 225 Pipeline Loop in Santa Clarita is 845 psi. Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 contain information on maintenance of offshore pipelines.

G126-2
Section 3.3.7.3 discusses the use of one of the Channel Islands as a potential alternative location for the regasification facility.

G126-3
The Applicant has only proposed that the Project be used for the importation, storage, regasification, and distribution of natural gas. If the facility were to be proposed for a different use, a new or modified application would be required as well as a new environmental assessment.

G126-4
The Project has been modified since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. Appendix D5 contains revised information on the seawater cooling elimination proposal. Section 3.3.9.1 evaluates alternative vaporization technologies.

subject them to loads from buoyancy and sea floor water currents.

6. Not known what pressure gas would be brought ashore. Several issues: G126-5

a. Higher pressure, less pumping required to introduce it to existing cross-country distribution system.

b. Lower pressure, safer the gas pipes run through urban areas to connect with existing cross-country pipes.

c. Lower the pressure, the longer the life of ocean floor pipes. In general metal fatigues faster if subjected to cyclic stresses in corrosive environment.

G126-5
See the response to Comment G126-1.

311524

Kusano, Ken LT

From: sdlgc [sdlgc@mail.acninc.net]
Sent: Friday, December 17, 2004 6:59 PM
To: ogginsc@slc.ca.gov; Kusano, Ken LT
Subject: Comments on the Cabrillo Port LNC Facility

USCG-04-16377-869

Sirs:
Below is a brief comment about the Cabrillo Port LNG Facility.

COMMENTS ON THE LNG FACILITY PROPOSAL,
by Guy F. Cooper, California PE license E 6193, Dec. 12, 2004.

Reference: EIS/EIR "Cabrillo Port, Liquified Natural Gas Deepwater Port"

I have the following comments on the subject EIS/EIR:

G534-1

1. Any land-based LNC terminal can be hazardous to public safety in an urban area. The proposed off-shore floating terminal (including gasification) seems reasonably safe. A major fuel-air explosion is unlikely (it would be ignited before optimum mixing could occur); even so, the blast over-pressures on land would be minimal due to the off-shore distance.

2. The most likely hazard of the off-shore terminal would be collision by a ship that has gotten out of its normal lane.

3. In the present climate of the increasing price of energy, and the increasing dependence on foreign sources, it is reasonable and expedient to diversify our various current foreign sources. At the same time, the development of long term domestic sources such as solar, wind, and nuclear, should continue. The LNG opposition argument that building the Cabrillo Port LNG facility would preclude these domestic sources is not logical and does not fit into a comprehensive, rational long term energy plan for California.

4. The opposition argument that the gas pipe lines would be something new and dangerous is also not correct, since we already have high pressure cross-country natural gas pipe lines. It would be advisable to have more frequent automatic gas shut-offs along urbanized routes in order to isolate a smaller length of pipe should there be a break.

5. An engineering issue that I did not find discussed to any great extent was the pressure at which the sea floor gas pipe lines would operate. Sea bed pipelines of various sorts are a proven technology; however, the stress in a corrosive (sea water) environment, as well as pressure fluctuations and sea flow currents could result in fatigue failure of the pipes. This would depend upon the working pressure and the pipe metal alloy and the outer protection.

G534-2

6. It appears that the Cabrillo site is the preferred and most likely location. However, should the terminal be located on one of the off-shore islands (after resolution of the environmental, political, and docking issues) the following spin-off's could be considered:
   a. The construction camp could later become a tourist or youth camping facility, or an oceanographic research facility on the island.
   b. Any major spill/fire/explosion would be confined to that part of the island.
   c. The terminal would be away from the shipping lanes.

G534-1
The maximum allowable operating pressure (MAOP) for each of the twin 24-inch subsea pipelines is 1,500 pounds per square inch gauge (psig). Over the length of the subsea pipelines, pressures would decrease to 1,100 psi at the meter and piping at the onshore metering station. The MAOP for the 36-inch Center Road Pipeline and its alternatives is 1,100 psi, and the MAOP for the 30-inch Line 225 Pipeline Loop in Santa Clarita is 845 psi. Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 contain information on maintenance of offshore pipelines.

G534-2
Section 3.3.7.3 discusses the use of one of the Channel Islands as a potential alternative location for the regasification facility.

G534-3

7. The terminal could form the basis for several spin-off industries: a terminal for exporting hydrocarbon gases produced in California; a thermodynamic heat sink to assist a food freeze-drying industry; and a supply for LNG-fueled busses and trucks (as opposed to CNG - compressed natural gas)

a. The twin 24 in. ocean floor pipes could be used to send out bound California-produced hydrocarbons for export during times when methane was not in-coming. Standard multiple-use technologies for high pressure pipes would be employed to prevent any mixing of different gases. The heat sink provided by the chilled LNG could help in liquefying the export gases. This is achieved by direct heat transfer from the export gas in question, provided it has a higher boiling point than that of LNG (-263 deg. F); or, the LNG could serve as a heat sink for more efficient additional refrigeration of the export gas to a liquid..

b. The gasified methane could be kept chilled during movement to shore where a food freeze-drying facility would use the free cold (head sink).

c, Chilled, high pressure gas brought ashore would require less refrigeration to convert it back to LNG for transportation use.

d. Chilled, high pressure gas brought ashore would, when run through an expander turbine, provide both a heat sink and pumping power to chill other hydrocarbon gases to be exported in liquid form.

G534-4

5. Rather than burning methane to gasify the LNG, it would be more economical and environmentally cleaner to use the ocean itself as the heat supply. This could involve using the sea bed pipes as the heat exchanger. A concentric insulated pipe system is envisioned to prevent freezing the adjacent sea water while controlling the heat input and boiling of the LNG along the length of the ocean floor pipes. Care must be taken not to freeze sea water about the pipes as this would subject them to loads from buoyancy and sea floor water currents.

G534-5

6. It is not known at what pressure the gas would be brought ashore. There are several issues to this:

a. The higher the pressure, the less pumping is required to bring it up to the existing cross-country distribution system.

b. The lower the pressure, the safer the gas pipes run through urban areas to connect with the existing cross-country gas system.

c. The lower the pressure, the longer the life of the ocean floor pipes. In general metal fatigues faster if subjected to cyclic stresses in a corrosive environment.

G534-6

7. At the present time, it is not known what commercial hydrocarbon gases could be economically exported in liquid form; or what the facility ashore would have to be to enable this. It will also be necessary to know the thermodynamics (boiling point, specific heats, heat transfer properties) of candidate gases. A comprehensive thermodynamic and economic analysis would point out the spin-off possibilities from the basic LNG facility

Sent via the ACN WebMail system

G534-3
The Applicant has only proposed that the Project be used for the importation, storage, regasification, and distribution of natural gas. If the facility were to be proposed for a different use, a new or modified application would be required as well as a new environmental assessment.

G534-4
The Project has been modified since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. Appendix D5 contains revised information on the seawater cooling elimination proposal. Section 3.3.9.1 evaluates alternative vaporization technologies.

G534-5
See the response to Comment G534-1.

G534-6
Thank you for the information.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/19/2004
First Name:	Keith
Last Name:	Cordingly
Address:	395 E. Main St.
City:	Greeen River
State:	UT
Zip Code:	84525
Topic:	Alternatives
Comments:	I want to thank everyone involved in this project and everyone at BHP Billiton for their effort in trying to make this project happen. This is a great idea. Currently I rely on propane to heat my home and the prices are outrageous. I do not have the option to use natural gas right now because there simply isn't any around, I am looking forward to the day when I do have the ability to use natural gas and I think Cabrillo port is a step in the right direction to making that happen.

G186-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/19/2004
First Name:	Marcy
Last Name:	Cordingly
Address:	395 E. Main St.
City:	Greeen River
State:	UT
Zip Code:	84525
Topic:	Alternatives
Comments:	I feel that the benefits of such a port would not be confined to California alone but this port is the first step to bringing more natural gas to the rest of the country. I, for one, would love to see this application approved for the benefit of all of the United States. My gas bill, especially in the winter months, is very high and any safe and effective method to reduce my costs would be great. I realize if this application is approved the port wouldn't be in operation until 2008 or so, but it is imperative that the decision to be approved be made as soon as possible. Thank You.

G191-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/20/2004
First Name:	Paul
Last Name:	Cornwell
Address:	8871 N. Winding Way
City:	Fair Oaks
State:	CA
Zip Code:	95628
Topic:	Biological Resources - Marine, Biological Resources - Terrestrial
Comments:	I can't believe it, but it seems that our Coast Guard was able to make it happen. An energy producing company is going to take the extra measures in protecting marine life. Where damage is done, strick midigation measures are in place. BHPB is being forced to look and act proactively at the potential impacts they will have on endangered species, and they are willing to do so. They have made many changes in the plans of this projec to further protect environment in as many ways as possible. Thank you for encouraging this to happen and thanks to BHPB for agreeing to do it. I fully support any project that takes these factors into consideration. Regards, Paul Cornwell

G243-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Source:
USCG Docket

JEA

Date: 12/17/04

OCEAN FUTURES SOCIETY

December 17th, 2004

California State Lands Commission
Attn: Cy Oggins
U.S. Coast Guard
Attn: Lieutenant Ken Kusano

Dear Cy Oggins and Lieutenant Kusano,

I am writing to provide comments on the proposed Cabrillo Port LNG Project Draft EIS/EIR. In addition to my concers about the document, I am aware of concerns stated by Congresswoman Lois Capps that California representatives need to assess if we need additional energy supplies and if so, is this project the best way to provide our energy needs.

Ocean Futures Society believes that California should look towards conservation measures and increased efficiency of existing processing facilities prior to investing in this LNG Project that relies on LNG delivered from Australia. Southern Califonia sealife, including migrating gray whales, depend upon our coastal waters for their survival. Adding an additional source of coastal noise and water pollution, as well as the looming threat of catastrophic accidents should be avoided if at all possible. G425-1

We have the following comments regarding the contents of the document:

Typo: In Table 4.2-1, Public Comment 8 says that the potential for hazardous offshore weather and sea conditions is discussed in Subsection 4.1.8, Offshore Oceanography and Meteorology. Section 4.1.8 is actually titled, "Underlying Assumptions, and 4.1.9 is Offshore Oceanography and Meteorology. G425-2

4.1.8 Underlying Assumptions

The applicant would implement the mitigation measures included in its application, the MMP and in supplemental submittals to the USCG and the CSLC.

Who will ensure they implement the mitigation measures? G425-3

4.1.9 Environmental Setting.

The Proposed Project uses data from three weather buoys located near the proposed site to characterize the meteorological conditions of the Proposed Project site. These buoys include the

Ocean Futures Society
325 Chapala Street
Santa Barbara,
California 93101 USA
TEL 805.899.8899
FAX 805.899.8898

Ocean Futures Europe
13 Rue de Tocqueville
75017 Paris FRANCE
TEL 33 1 42 27 26 67
FAX 33 1 42 27 28 82

www.oceanfutures.org

2004/G425

G425-1
Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

G425-2
Section 4.2 has been reorganized. Table 4.2-2 contains information on this topic.

G425-3
The lead Federal and State agencies share the responsibility to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented. Table 6.1-1 in Chapter 6 is the basis for the Mitigation Monitoring Program, which would be implemented, consistent with section 15097(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, to ensure that each mitigation measure is incorporated into Project design, construction, operation, and maintenance activities.

JEAN-MICHEL COUSTEAU'S
OCEAN FUTURES SOCIETY

Catalina Ridge buoy, the Santa Monica Bay Buoy, and the Point Dume buoy. These buoys are generally located to the north, east and south of the proposed project site.

There is an additional buoy located west of the Proposed Project site from which no data was used to characterize the meteorological conditions at the Proposed Project site. Station 46503, owned and operated by the National Data Buoy Center, is located in the East Santa Barbara Channel approximately 25 miles west of the Proposed Project site. Meteorological conditions at Station 46503 are likely more extreme than conditions at the buoys utilized in the EIS report due to its location in the Santa Barbara Channel, where northwest winds frequently blow southeast from Point Conception directly towards the East Channel Buoy and the Proposed Project site. G425-4

It would be helpful if the document provided and analyzed data from Station 46503 and how it may or may not help determine meteorological conditions at the Proposed Site.

The EIS states that the Applicant intends to design the FSRU and its mooring system based on 100-year wind/wave sea states. Is a 100-year wind/wave sea state sufficient for the Santa Barbara Channel? The Santa Barbara Channel can have very nasty surface conditions, and how often does a 100-year event occur? What effect will a 500-year event have on the FSRU and what would be the consequences? G425-5

Section 4.1.9.1 Line 38 (typo)

The eastern entrance to the Santa Barbara Channel is located northwest of the Proposed Project site, not to the northeast, as the report states. G425-6

Section 4.7.33 Significance Criteria for Impacts to Marine Mammals

Line 30 states that the project impacts would be considered significant if the project causes a Level B take of a listed or candidate species or a Level B take of significant numbers (more than 10) of marine mammals. Over what time period are these impacts to be assessed? During construction, annually, or over the life of the project? And who will monitor and record the number of marine mammal takes? G425-7

Similarly, Line 35 states that that the project impacts would be considered significant if the project causes substantial deviations of migration routes for significant numbers (more than 10) of marine mammals. Over what time period are these impacts to be assessed? During construction, annually, or over the life of the project?

Ocean Futures Society
325 Chapala Street
Santa Barbara,
California 93101 USA
TEL 805.899.8899
FAX 805.899.8898

Ocean Futures Europe
13 Rue de Tocqueville
75017 Paris FRANCE
TEL 33 1 42 27 26 67
FAX 33 1 42 27 28 82

www.oceanfutures.org

G425-4
Section 4.1.8.5 contains information on meteorology and climate in the Project area, including average wind speed and direction. Information on wind speed and direction is also summarized in Appendix C2. Data presented are from National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Buoy 46025 (Catalina Ridge), which is approximately 7 NM (8.05 miles) south of the proposed FSRU site. Of the three buoys nearest the proposed FSRU site (see Figure 4.1-1 for buoy locations), NOAA Buoy 46025 is the most exposed and has the longest data record (1982 to 2004). Information from NOAA Buoy 46053 was not used, as this buoy is located in the Santa Barbara Channel, 12 NM (14 miles) southwest of Santa Barbara and about 46.6 NM (53.6 miles) to the west-northwest from the FSRU's proposed location in the Santa Monica Basin.

G425-5
Sections 4.1.8.3 and 4.1.8.4 contain additional information on this topic.

The regulations implementing the Deepwater Port Act (33 CFR 149.625 (a)) require that "each component, except for hoses, mooring lines, and aids to navigation buoys, must be designed to withstand at least the combined wind, wave, and current forces of the most severe storm that can be expected to occur at the deepwater port in any 100-year period." Accordingly, a 500-year event was not analyzed.

By definition, a 100-year wave event is expected to occur once every 100 years on average over the course of many hundreds of years. The estimated 100-year wave height (7+ meters) and peak wave period (16+ seconds) at the FSRU exceed any waves generated locally by strong northwest winds. The most extreme waves are primarily generated in the deep ocean and propagate through the Channel Islands.

G425-6
The text in Section 4.1.9 has been revised in response to the comment.

G425-7
The text in Section 4.7.3 has been reorganized. Section 4.7.3.5 contains revised text on this topic. Section 4.7.4 contains information on marine biological resources (including marine mammals) impacts and mitigation. Section 4.7.4 also contains information on responsibilities for and timing of mitigation

measures, which include marine mammal monitoring.

"Protect the Ocean and You Protect Yourself."

JEAN-MICHEL COUSTEAU'S
OCEAN FUTURES SOCIETY

Section 4.7.3.4 Significance Criteria for Impacts to Seabirds

This section mentions that project impacts would be considered significant if the project causes injuries or mortalities to substantial numbers (more than 10) of non-listed seabirds, or causes substantial deviations of migration routes to significant numbers (more than 10) of sea birds. Over what time period are these impacts to be assessed? During construction, annually, or over the life of the project? And who will monitor and record the number of Seabird takes? G425-8

Table 4.7.8 BioMar-10 states that noise from construction and vessel operation could disrupt migrations, interfere with or mask communications, prey and predator detection, and/or navigation; cause adverse behavioral changes; or result in temporary or permanent hearing loss. The project proposes to mitigate noise during construction by constructing outside the gray whale migration season – but does not offer any mitigation measures for operation.

We are only beginning to understand the affects of noise on whales and other sea life and this additional source of pollution should be avoided if California can supply an alternate source of energy. G425-9

However, for the purposes of this study, there should be mitigation measures and standards suggested for the operation of this project. Noises can be muted, ships can be quieted, operational guidelines can be created to minimize noises while at anchor, and other measures must be discussed and employed to make the facility operation as quiet as possible.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment of this proposed project and for taking into consideration the concerns of California citizens.

Sincerely,

Jean-Michel Cousteau — President

Jim Knowlton — Editor

Ocean Futures Society
325 Chapela Street
Santa Barbara,
California 93101 USA
TEL 805.899.8899
FAX 805.899.8898

Ocean Futures Europe
13 Rue de Tocqueville
75017 Paris FRANCE
TEL 33 1 42 27 26 67
FAX 33 1 42 27 28 82

www.oceanfutures.org

G425-8
The text in Section 4.7.3 has been reorganized. Section 4.7.3.3 contains revised text on significance criteria for impacts on seabirds. Section 4.7.4 contains information on impacts on marine biological resources, including seabirds.

The analysis indicates that Project impacts on seabirds would not exceed the level of significance. In the event of an accidental spill, as discussed in Impact BioMar-6, the provisions of the Lempert-Keene-Seastrand Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act would apply (see Table 4.7-7).

G425-9
Impact BioMar-5 in Section 4.7.4 contains revised text on this topic.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/17/2004
First Name:	Julia
Last Name:	Cronin
Address:	3407 Vine Circle
City:	Rocklin
State:	CA
Zip Code:	95765
Topic:	Other/General Comment
Comments:	I am personally happy to see the amount of effort BHP has taken to mitigate some of the concerns originally voiced over their project. The willingness of the officials to make a project that is environmentally sensitive but will still deliver affordable natural gas is commendable. We need to find common sense solutions to our energy problems and this is a prime example of a project that balances all interests to work towards a solution. The Cabrillo Port facility is by far the best proposal that has come forth to help address California's LNG needs. This is why I am in full favor of the project.

G103-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/20/2004
First Name:	Delia
Last Name:	Cruz
Address:	7471 19th St.
City:	Sacramento
State:	CA
Zip Code:	95822
Topic:	Other/General Comment
Comments:	The Cabrillo Port Project needs to be approved. There is no danger to any person, marine life, the environment, our comfort, or our children. There will be a negative impact on our comfort if it's not built. The cost of natural gas will skyrocket driving prices up for everything. We think if we don't have natural gas in our homes we don't have to worry about it's production. We forget that many businesses survive on it and we will all be affected if we don't start finding sources of natural gas. BHPB and the Coast Guard have done a fantastic job pulling this project together. We must support it.

G338-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/20/2004
First Name:	Jose
Last Name:	Cruz
Address:	7471 19th St.
City:	Sacramento
State:	CA
Zip Code:	95822
Topic:	Land Use
Comments:	How many nonfunction oil platforms are off California's coastline? The beauty of Cabrillo Port it that it's a floating structure that can be removed when it's no longer needed. And it will utilize resources from Australia therefore further protecting our own natural resources for future use. We won't even know the structure is there. It's lot better than using our lands for drilling and storage of natural gas.

G290-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin:	E&E Website
Date:	12/20/2004
First Name:	Dennis
Last Name:	Cunnington
Topic:	Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis
Comments:	Okay, I have kids and I can't believe that people are going so low as to say create the fear that there could be exploding gas line beneath schools - and in poor communities non the less. Gas lines are all over our country. Many schools heating systems are powered by natural gas. This is just another feable attempt to stop a good project. I support Cabrillo Port and would be appauld if the project were stopped due to such unfounded reasons.

G318-1
Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.